

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 11-14, 16, 17, 21 and 22 are amended for clarification and/or to correct antecedent basis inconsistencies. Claim 1 is further at paragraphs [0012] and [0062]. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Dowling during the April 15, 2003 telephone interview. The points discussed during the interview are incorporated in the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

**I. Amendment Entry after Final Rejection**

Entry of this amendment is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: a) place the application in condition for allowance (for all the reasons discussed herein); b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration; c) place the application in better condition for appeal (if necessary); and d) address formal requirements of the Final Rejection and preceding Office Action.

The foregoing amendments do not raise any new issues after Final Rejection. Therefore, entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment.

**II. The Finality of the Action Should be Withdrawn**

The June 3, 2003 Office Action makes the Action Final. Applicant asserts that the March 4, 2003 Amendment does not appear to have necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in the Office Action.

Under MPEP §706.07(a), where the Examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by Applicant's amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement, this second Office Action should not be

made a Final Rejection. The Examiner does not appear to have based the second Office Action on the substance of Applicant's prior amendment. This mere amplification of issue should not have been asserted as a basis of the Final Rejection. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Final Status of the outstanding Office Action.

**III. Claims 1-22 Satisfy the Requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph**

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being non-enabling. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, the Final Office Action asserts that paragraphs [0014] and [0017] appear to contradict each other. Applicant respectfully submits that paragraph [0014] describes the polarization-conversion system 14 changing a polarized P-wave to an S-wave by a phase plate. Further, paragraph [0017] describes the PBS array 15 separating the secondary light-source image. The secondary light-source image is formed in the PBS array 15 by polarization, spatially separating the S and P wave portions to form a pair state.

The features recited in Applicant's claims are clearly described in the specification and figures. For example, claim 1 recites a light-source (lamp 10), a polarizing unit (polarization-conversion system 14), a color-separation unit (diachronic mirrors 22, 24), liquid crystal panels (42R, 42G, 42B), a color-combining unit (prism 50), a projecting unit (projection lens 70), and a polarization separator formed by a first reflection polarizing member (plates 60, 110, 140, 170, 190) and a second absorption polarizing member (62, 112, 142, 171, 191). See paragraphs [0012], [0021], [0025], [0026], [0076], [0086], [0095], [0101] and Figs. 2, 8, 10, 13 and 14. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

**IV. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

Based on the December 4, 2002 Office Action, the Final Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,331,060 to Yamamoto *et al.* (Yamamoto). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yamamoto does not teach or suggest a projection display apparatus for use with an object to be projected, including, *inter alia*, a color-combining unit that combines the plurality of colors respectively modulated by the plurality of liquid crystal panels so as to generate composite light including the plurality of colors, whereby the composite light comprises at least one of first light rays and second light rays; a polarization separator that separates the first light rays, which are modulated by the liquid crystal panels, from the second light rays, which are modulated by the liquid crystal panels, by allowing the first light rays to pass therethrough while reflecting the second light rays therefrom, and a projecting unit that projects the first light rays onto the object, the polarization separator being formed by a first reflection polarizing member disposed to face the color-combining unit and a second absorption polarization member disposed to face the projecting unit, as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Yamamoto discloses a projection-type display device having polarization separation elements 49 and 54 formed by laminating films. Specifically, Yamamoto teaches a first polarization separation element 49 between the lamp 42 and the beam splitter 50, and a second polarization separation element 54 between the beam splitter 50 and the projection lens 55. See col. 17, lines 23-51, col. 20, lines 34-50, col. 21, lines 16-33 and Fig. 10 of Yamamoto.

Yamamoto provides for selectively transmitting the P-polarization component and selectively reflecting the orthogonal S-polarizing component. However, Yamamoto such reflections are not deflected, as provided in Applicant's features. Nor does Yamamoto provide a polarization separator formed by a reflection polarization member facing the color-combination unit (analogous to the beam splitter), and an absorption polarization member facing the projecting unit (analogous to the projection lens). Thus, Yamamoto fails to anticipate Applicant's claimed features.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claim is now patentable over the applied reference. Consequently, all the claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Gerhard W. Thielman  
Registration No. 43,186

JAO:GWT/gwt

Date: September 2, 2003

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
P.O. Box 19928  
Alexandria, Virginia 22320  
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

RECEIVED  
SEP - 2 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION  
Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461